UCRHEP-T544
December 2014

arXiv:1409.1162v2 [hep-ph] 22 Dec 2014

$SU(2)_N$ Model of Vector Dark Matter with a Leptonic Connection

Sean Fraser, Ernest Ma, and Mohammadreza Zakeri

Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of California, Riverside, California 92521, USA

Abstract

Models of fermion and scalar dark matter abound. Here we consider instead vector dark matter, from an $SU(2)_N$ extension of the standard model. It has a number of interesting properties, including a possible implementation of the inverse seesaw mechanism for neutrino mass. The annihilation of dark matter for calculating its relic abundance in this model is not dominated by its cross section to standard-model particles, but rather to other new particles which are in thermal equlibrium with those of the standard model.

Whereas the existence of dark matter is universally accepted, its nature remains unknown. It is usually assumed to be a single particle, but it may also be more than one [1]. In specific models, it is often considered to be a fermion or scalar. However, vector dark matter is certainly also possible [2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9]. In this paper we consider a variant of an $SU(2)_N$ model proposed previously [5, 6]. The difference is that in our present study, all standard-model (SM) fermions are singlets under $SU(2)_N$, whereas in the earlier work, that was not the case.

The new particles of our model are the three neutral gauge bosons $X_{1,2,3}$ of $SU(2)_N$, three copies of a neutral Dirac fermion $SU(2)_N$ doublet $(n_1, n_2)_{L,R}$, a neutral scalar $SU(2)_N$ doublet (χ_1, χ_2), and a scalar bidoublet

$$\zeta = \begin{pmatrix} \zeta_1^0 & \zeta_2^0 \\ \zeta_1^- & \zeta_2^- \end{pmatrix},$$

which transform (vertically) under $SU(2)_L \times U(1)$ and (horizontally) under $SU(2)_N$. The allowed Yukawa and trilinear scalar couplings are

$$(\bar{\nu}_L \zeta_1^0 + \bar{e}_L \zeta_1^-) n_{1R} + (\bar{\nu}_L \zeta_2^0 + \bar{e}_L \zeta_2^-) n_{2R}, \tag{1}$$

$$(\phi^0 \zeta_1^0 - \phi^+ \zeta_1^-) \chi_1 + (\phi^0 \zeta_2^0 - \phi^+ \zeta_2^-) \chi_2. \tag{2}$$

In analogy to the earlier work [5, 6], we impose a global $U(1)$ symmetry S' on the new particles so that n and χ have $S' = 1/2$ and ζ has $S' = -1/2$. As χ_2 breaks $SU(2)_N$ completely, $T_{3N} + S' = S$ remains exact, under which $n_1, \chi_1 \sim +1$, $n_2, \chi_2, \zeta_2 \sim 0$, and $\zeta_1 \sim -1$. As for the vector gauge bosons, $X(\bar{X}) = (X_1 \mp i X_2)/\sqrt{2} \sim \pm 1$ and $Z' = X_3 \sim 0$. Note that S' distinguishes the bidoublet ζ from its dual $\tilde{\zeta} = \sigma_2 \zeta^* \sigma_2$, and forbids certain terms in the Lagrangian which would be otherwise allowed. In Refs. [5, 6], the residual $U(1)$ symmetry S is broken explicitly to $(-1)^S$. Here it remains exact up to possible Planck scale corrections, but for the stability of dark matter on the scale of the lifetime of the Universe, this is not a serious concern. Note that without ζ, the dark sector would only communicate

with the SM through the Higgs portal. Here ζ serves another purpose, i.e. neutrino mass. This connection is of course an assumption of the model, but once chosen, it leads naturally to an inverse seesaw mechanism for neutrino mass [10, 11, 12].

Consider first the neutrino mass matrix spanning $(\bar{\nu}_L, n_{2R}, \bar{n}_{2L})$, i.e.

$$\mathcal{M}_{\nu n} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & m_D & 0 \\ m_D & 0 & M \\ 0 & M & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{3}$$

where m_D comes from $\langle \zeta_2^0 \rangle$ and M is an allowed invariant mass. It is clear that this results in one heavy Dirac fermion and one massless neutrino corresponding to $\cos\theta \nu_L - \sin\theta n_{2L}$, where $\tan\theta = m_D/M$. As such, lepton number L is conserved, with $n_{1,2}$ also having $L = 1$ To obtain a nonzero neutrino mass, a scalar triplet Δ under $SU(2)_N$ is required. Let

$$\Delta = \begin{pmatrix} \Delta_2/\sqrt{2} & \Delta_3 \\ \Delta_1 & -\Delta_2/\sqrt{2} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{4}$$

with $S' = -1$, then the terms

$$n_1 n_1 \Delta_1 + (n_1 n_2 + n_2 n_1)\Delta_2/\sqrt{2} - n_2 n_2 \Delta_3, \tag{5}$$

where each nn denotes either $n_L n_L$ or $n_R n_R$, break L to $(-1)^L$ with a nonzero $\langle \Delta_3 \rangle$, without breaking S. Note that whereas $\langle \Delta_1 \rangle$ as well as $\langle \Delta_3 \rangle$ must be nonzero (and large) in the model of Ref. [6], thus breaking S to $(-1)^S$, only $\langle \Delta_3 \rangle$ is nonzero here and it is very small for the implementation of the inverse seesaw [10, 11, 12]:

$$\mathcal{M}_{\nu n} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & m_D & 0 \\ m_D & m_2' & M \\ 0 & M & m_2 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{6}$$

where m_2 comes from $\langle \Delta_3^* \rangle$ and m_2' from $\langle \Delta_3 \rangle$. This means that an inverse seesaw neutrino mass is obtained:

$$m_\nu \simeq \frac{m_D^2 m_2}{M^2}. \tag{7}$$

Let $\langle \phi^0 \rangle = v_1$, $\langle \zeta_2^0 \rangle = v_2$, $\langle \chi_2 \rangle = u_2$, $\langle \Delta_3 \rangle = u_3$, with g_N the $SU(2)_N$ gauge coupling, then the masses of the vector gauge bosons of this model are

$$m_W^2 = \frac{1}{2} g_2^2 (v_1^2 + v_2^2), \qquad m_X^2 = \frac{1}{2} g_N^2 (u_2^2 + v_2^2 + 2u_3^2), \tag{8}$$

$$m_{Z,Z'}^2 = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} (g_1^2 + g_2^2)(v_1^2 + v_2^2) & -g_N \sqrt{(g_1^2 + g_2^2)} v_2^2 \\ -g_N \sqrt{(g_1^2 + g_2^2)} v_2^2 & g_N^2 (u_2^2 + v_2^2 + 4u_3^2) \end{pmatrix}, \tag{9}$$

where X_3 has been renamed Z'. In this model, all the SM fermions obtain masses from v_1, except for the neutrinos which require v_2, i.e. m_D in Eqs. (6) and (7). We assume v_2 (which causes $Z - Z'$ mixing) and u_3 (which breaks L to $(-1)^L$) to be small. Note that the Z' of this model does not couple directly to SM particles, this means that it is not easily observable at the Large Hadron Collider (LHC) as other Z' bosons which are produced by quarks and decay into lepton pairs. This issue will be studied in more detail elsewhere.

Another important difference is that whereas the $X_{1,2}$ relic abundance is determind by their annihilation cross section to standard-model (SM) particles in Ref. [6], it is determined by $X\bar{X} \to \zeta_2 \zeta_2^\dagger$ here. Thermalization with SM particles is maintained through $\zeta_2 \zeta_2^\dagger \to l^- l^+$, etc.

We now supply the details of this model. The Higgs potential is given by

$$\begin{aligned} V &= \mu_\zeta^2 Tr(\zeta^\dagger \zeta) + \mu_\Phi^2 \Phi^\dagger \Phi + \mu_\chi^2 \chi^\dagger \chi + \mu_\Delta^2 Tr(\Delta^\dagger \Delta) + (\mu_1 \tilde{\Phi}^\dagger \zeta \chi + \mu_2 \tilde{\chi}^\dagger \Delta \chi + H.c.) \\ &+ \frac{1}{2}\lambda_1 [Tr(\zeta^\dagger \zeta)]^2 + \frac{1}{2}\lambda_2 (\Phi^\dagger \Phi)^2 + \frac{1}{2}\lambda_3 Tr(\zeta^\dagger \zeta \zeta^\dagger \zeta) + \frac{1}{2}\lambda_4 (\chi^\dagger \chi)^2 + \frac{1}{2}\lambda_5 [Tr(\Delta^\dagger \Delta)]^2 \\ &+ \frac{1}{4}\lambda_6 Tr(\Delta^\dagger \Delta - \Delta \Delta^\dagger)^2 + f_1 \chi^\dagger \tilde{\zeta}^\dagger \tilde{\zeta} \chi + f_2 \chi^\dagger \zeta^\dagger \zeta \chi + f_3 \Phi^\dagger \zeta \zeta^\dagger \Phi + f_4 \Phi^\dagger \tilde{\zeta} \tilde{\zeta}^\dagger \Phi \\ &+ f_5 (\Phi^\dagger \Phi)(\chi^\dagger \chi) + f_6 (\chi^\dagger \chi) Tr(\Delta^\dagger \Delta) + f_7 \chi^\dagger (\Delta \Delta^\dagger - \Delta^\dagger \Delta) \chi + f_8 (\Phi^\dagger \Phi) Tr(\Delta^\dagger \Delta) \\ &+ f_9 Tr(\zeta^\dagger \zeta) Tr(\Delta^\dagger \Delta) + f_{10} Tr[\zeta (\Delta^\dagger \Delta - \Delta \Delta^\dagger) \zeta^\dagger], \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

where

$$\tilde{\Phi}^\dagger = (\phi^0, -\phi^+), \quad \tilde{\chi}^\dagger = (\chi_2, -\chi_1), \quad \tilde{\zeta} = \begin{pmatrix} \zeta_2^+ & -\zeta_1^+ \\ -\bar{\zeta}_2^0 & \bar{\zeta}_1^0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{11}$$

It is the same as that of Ref. [6] but with two fewer terms. The reason is that S is conserved in our model, whereas S breaks to $(-1)^S$ in Ref. [6]

The spontaneous symmetry breaking of $SU(2)_N$ is mainly through $\langle \chi_2 \rangle = u_2$, where

$$u_2^2 \simeq \frac{-\mu_\chi^2}{\lambda_4}. \tag{12}$$

As previously mentioned, this breaks both $SU(2)_N$ and S', but the combination $T_{3N} + S' = S$ remains exact. The further breaking of $SU(2)_N$ by $\langle \Delta_3 \rangle = u_3$ is assumed to be small for the implementation of the inverse seesaw mechanism, i.e.

$$u_3 \simeq \frac{-\mu_2 u_2^2}{\mu_\Delta^2 + (f_6 - f_7) u_2^2}. \tag{13}$$

This also does not break S, but it breaks L to $(-1)^L$ because of Eq. (5). The spontaneous symmetry breaking of $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ is mainly through $\langle \phi^0 \rangle = v_1$, where

$$v_1^2 \simeq \frac{-\mu_\Phi^2 - f_5 u_2^2}{\lambda_2}. \tag{14}$$

The further breaking of $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y \times SU(2)_N$ through $\langle \zeta_2^0 \rangle = v_2$ is assumed small, i.e.

$$v_2 \simeq \frac{-\mu_1 v_1 u_2}{\mu_\zeta^2 + f_2 u_2^2}. \tag{15}$$

This also does not break S.

The resulting physical scalar particles of this model have the following masses:

$$m^2(\sqrt{2} Re\chi_2) \simeq 2\lambda_4 u_2^2, \quad m^2(\sqrt{2} Re\phi^0) \simeq 2\lambda_2 v_1^2, \quad m^2(\zeta_2^0) \simeq \mu_\zeta^2 + f_2 u_2^2 + f_4 v_1^2, \tag{16}$$

$$m^2(\zeta_2^-) \simeq \mu_\zeta^2 + f_2 u_2^2 + f_3 v_1^2, \quad m^2(\zeta_1^0) \simeq \mu_\zeta^2 + f_1 u_2^2 + f_4 v_1^2, \tag{17}$$

$$m^2(\zeta_1^-) \simeq \mu_\zeta^2 + f_1 u_2^2 + f_3 v_1^2, \quad m^2(\Delta_3) \simeq \mu_\Delta^2 + (f_6 - f_7) u_2^2 + f_8 v_1^2, \tag{18}$$

$$m^2(\Delta_2) \simeq \mu_\Delta^2 + f_6 u_2^2 + f_8 v_1^2, \quad m^2(\Delta_1) \simeq \mu_\Delta^2 + (f_6 + f_7) u_2^2 + f_8 v_1^2. \tag{19}$$

Of all the particles having nonzero S, i.e. $\zeta_1^0, \zeta_1^-, \Delta_2, \Delta_1, n_1$ and X, we assume that X is the lightest. Of all the new particles having zero S, i.e. $\zeta_2^0, \zeta_2^-, \Delta_3, \sqrt{2} Re\chi_2, n_2$ and Z', we

assume that ζ_2^0, ζ_2^- are lighter than X so that $X\bar{X} \to \zeta_2^0 \bar{\zeta}_2^0 + \zeta_2^- \zeta_2^+$ is kinematically allowed. Since Δ_1 has $S = -2$, if $m(\Delta_3) < 2m_X$, it is also stable and may become a significant second component [1] of dark matter. We will explore this very interesting possibility elsewhere.



Figure 1: Annihilation of $X\bar{X}$ to $\zeta_2\zeta_2^\dagger$.

The annihilation of $X\bar{X} \to \zeta_2\zeta_2^\dagger$ proceeds via the diagrams of Fig. 1. Assuming X and $\bar{X}$ to be at rest, this amplitude is given by

$$\mathcal{A} = \frac{g_N^2}{2}\left[\vec{\epsilon}_1 \cdot \vec{\epsilon}_2 + \frac{4(\vec{\epsilon}_1 \cdot \vec{k})(\vec{\epsilon}_2 \cdot \vec{k})}{m_{\zeta_1}^2 + m_X^2 - m_{\zeta_2}^2}\right], \tag{20}$$

where $\vec{k}$ is the three-momentum of ζ_2, and $\epsilon_{1,2}$ are the polarizations of X and $\bar{X}$. Summing over ζ_2^0 and ζ_2^-, and averaging over the spins of X and $\bar{X}$, the corresponding cross section $\times$ their relative velocity is given by

$$\sigma \times v_{rel} = \frac{g_N^4}{576\pi m_X^2}\sqrt{1 - \frac{m_{\zeta_2}^2}{m_X^2}}\left(2 + \left[1 + \frac{4(m_X^2 - m_{\zeta_2}^2)}{m_{\zeta_1}^2 + m_X^2 - m_{\zeta_2}^2}\right]^2\right). \tag{21}$$

Since $m_{\zeta_1} > m_X$ by assumption, the above expression is bounded from below by $m_{\zeta_1} \to \infty$ and from above by $m_{\zeta_1} = m_X$. We plot in Fig. 2 the allowed region for m_X/g_N^2 as a function of $r = m_{\zeta_2}^2/m_X^2$ for the optimum value [13] of $\sigma \times v_{rel} = 4.4 \times 10^{-26}$ cm^3 s^{-1} implied by the observed relic abundance of dark matter in the Universe, taking into account that X is a complex vector field.



Figure 2: Allowed values of m_X/g_N^2 plotted against $r = m_{\zeta_2}^2/m_X^2$ from relic abundance.

To detect X in underground experiments using elastic scattering off nuclei, the only possible connection is through $\phi^0 - \chi_2$ mixing. The 125 GeV particle h discovered [14, 15] at the LHC is a linear combination of $\sqrt{2}Re\phi^0$, $\sqrt{2}Re\zeta_2^0$, and $\sqrt{2}Re\chi_2$. The induced $hX\bar{X}$ interaction is approximately given by $(g_N^2 v_1/\sqrt{2})(f_5/\lambda_4)$. Since h interacts with quarks through $\sqrt{2}Re\phi^0$ according to $(m_q/\sqrt{2}v_1)\bar{q}q$, there is a small cross section for X to be detected in such experiments. Following Ref. [16], we obtain

$$\frac{f_p}{m_p} = -0.075\left[\frac{g_N^2(f_5/\lambda_4)}{4m_\phi^2}\right] - 0.925(3.51)\left[\frac{g_N^2(f_5/\lambda_4)}{54m_\phi^2}\right], \quad (22)$$

$$\frac{f_n}{m_n} = -0.078\left[\frac{g_N^2(f_5/\lambda_4)}{4m_\phi^2}\right] - 0.922(3.51)\left[\frac{g_N^2(f_5/\lambda_4)}{54m_\phi^2}\right], \quad (23)$$

with the spin-independent elastic cross section for X scattering off a nucleus of Z protons

and $A - Z$ neutrons normalized to one nucleon given by

$$\sigma_0 = \frac{1}{\pi}\left(\frac{m_N}{m_X + Am_N}\right)^2 \left|\frac{Zf_p + (A-Z)f_n}{A}\right|^2 . \tag{24}$$

Using the recent LUX data [17], we plot in Fig. 3 the maximum allowed value of $g_N^2(f_5/\lambda_4)$ as a function of m_X using $m_\phi = 125$ GeV. We also plot the allowed regions of g_N^2 versus m_X for $r = 0.2$ and $r = 0.8$ from Fig. 2. We see that for moderate values of m_X, future improvement in direct detection will probe the allowed region from relic abundance if f_5/λ_4 is not too small.



Figure 3: Allowed values of g_N^2 from relic abundance and $g_N^2(f_5/\lambda_4)$ from LUX, plotted against m_X.

In conclusion, we have discussed in this paper a simple and realistic model of vector dark

matter based on $SU(2)_N$. It has a leptonic connection which is a natural framework for the inverse seesaw mechanism to generate a small Majorana neutrino mass. It also accommodates a standard-model Higgs boson which mixes only slightly with its $SU(2)_N$ counterpart, which does not couple directly to any standard-model particle. Thus the observed 125 GeV particle behaves as the one Higgs boson of the standard model for all practical purposes. The scalar particle content of this model may also allow a stable second component of dark matter, because of kinematics, and not because the dark symmetry is extended. This is the first explicit example of how such a general situation may occur, a topic we will explore in another paper. The $SU(2)_N$ gauge symmetry is also suitable to be embedded in an $SU(7)$ model unfifying matter and dark matter, as outlined in Ref. [18].

This work is supported in part by the U. S. Department of Energy under Grant No. de-sc0008541.

References

[1] Q.-H. Cao, E. Ma, J. Wudka, and C.-P. Yuan, arXiv:0711.3881.

[2] G. Servant and T. M. P. Tait, Nucl. Phys. **B650**, 391 (2003).

[3] J. Hubisz and P. Meade, Phys. Rev. **D71**, 035016 (2005).

[4] T. Hambye, JHEP **0901**, 028 (2009).

[5] J. L. Diaz-Cruz and E. Ma, Phys. Lett. **B695**, 264 (2011).

[6] S. Bhattacharya, J. L. Diaz-Cruz, E. Ma, and D. Wegman, Phys. Rev. **D85**, 055008 (2012).

[7] T. Abe, M. Kakizaki, S. Matsumoto, and O. Seto, Phys. Lett. **B713**, 211 (2012).

[8] Y. Farzan and A. Rezaei Akbarieh, JCAP **1210**, 026 (2012).

[9] S. Baek, P. Ko, W.-I. Park, and E. Senaha, JHEP **1305**, 036 (2013).

[10] D. Wyler and L. Wolfenstein, Nucl. Phys. **B218**, 205 (1983).

[11] R. N. Mohapatra and J. W. F. Valle, Phys. Rev. **D34**, 1642 (1986).

[12] E. Ma, Phys. Lett. **B191**, 287 (1987).

[13] G. Steigman, B. Dasgupta, and J. F. Beacom, Phys. Rev. **D86**, 023506 (2012).

[14] ATLAS Collaboration, G. Aad *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B716**, 1 (2012).

[15] CMS Collaboration, S. Chatrchyan *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B716**, 30 (2012).

[16] J. Hisano, K. Ishiwata, N. Nagata, and M. Yamanaka, Prog. Theor. Phys. **126**, 435 (2011).

[17] LUX Collaboration, D. S. Akerib *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 091303 (2014).

[18] E. Ma, Phys. Rev. **D88**, 117702 (2013).